

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Han et al. (U.S. 2004/0114372 A1). Claims 2 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by the aforementioned reference to Han et al. taken in view of Skinner (U.S. 6,341,879).

In addition, the Examiner has objected to language informalities in claims 1 and 7.

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but is indicated as being otherwise allowable.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 7 as noted above to correct the outstanding informalities. It is believed that these amendments overcome the objections noted on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 of the instant application is not anticipated by Han et al. Claim 1 of the instant application now comprises following components:

1. the base 40, having a plurality of parallel-arranged lamps 401;
2. the supporter plate 41, mounted over the base 40, further having the frame 411 and a plurality of the wires 412, in which the frame 411 is a square structure having a central opening (encircled there inside by the square frame 411 as shown in FIG.3), in which each of the wires 412 is constructed at the frame 411 and crosses the central opening; and
3. a plurality of the films 42, mounted over and supported by the supporter plate 41.

Applicants respectfully submit that the supporter plate 41 of the instant application is introduced to support the films 42 (section 0033), in which the films 42 include a prism film, a film to diffuse lights, a film to achieve a haze effect, a color-filtering film, a depolarizing film, and any other film to meet a design purpose

(section 0031). Namely, the supporter plate 41 is individual and on purpose to bear the films stacked thereabove.

On the other hand, the electromagnetic-wave shielding member 222f of Han et al., though having a mesh shape, is a cross-line combination sandwiched, by coating, between the upper diffusing plate 222a and the lower shielding-line protection film 222g (section 0067). Also, it is noted that the assembly of the 222a, 222f and 222g does not support itself but is supported by the mold frame 224 (section 0071). Apparently, without the mold frame 224, the assembly of 222a, 222f and 222g, in particular the 222f itself, can't be treated as the supporter plate 41 of the instant application.

Equally importantly, Applicants respectfully submit that the supporter plate 41 of the instant application, constructed with the frame 411, the wires 412 and the central opening, is a mesh-like structure with a "real" central empty space (i.e. the central opening) formed by the square frame 411 (section 0030). Such a limitation of the central opening on the supporter plate 41 is obviously not found in Han et al, where the diffusing plate 222a and the shielding-line protection film 222g are films and thus solid matters (section 0067).

Applicants respectfully submit that the wires 412 of the instant application are provided for a supporting purpose. However, the electromagnetic-wave shielding member 222f of Han et al. is provided for an electromagnetic-wave shielding purpose. Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not adopt a member for electromagnetic-wave shielding purposes like the shielding-line protection film 222g for a member for supporting purposes like the supporter plate 41 of the instant application.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, a reference can not anticipate a claimed structure, unless it disclosures each and every feature of the claims. It is believed to be abundantly clear that Han et al. do not show every feature of Applicant's claimed structure and, therefore, could not possibly anticipate any of Applicant's claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. The outstanding rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully traversed.

Applicant also traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 9 as being rendered obvious by Han et al. taken in view of Skinner. As noted on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has realized that Han et al. do not disclose a cold cathode fluorescent lamp, or an interior bottom surface of the base coated with a reflection material, and has cited the secondary reference to Skinner as illustrating these features.

Even if Skinner were combined with Han et al., as suggested by the Examiner, the resultant combination would still not teach the features of Applicant's invention as noted above in the discussion of the reference to Han et al. It is submitted that none of the features of Applicant's invention that are not shown by Han et al., as noted above, are shown by Skinner. Therefore, the combination of Han et al. and Skinner would also suffer the same deficiencies as the reference to Han et al. noted in the foregoing discussion.

Thus, since the combination cited by the Examiner does not disclose the features of Applicant's claimed structure, it is not believed that this combination of references could possibly render obvious Applicant's claims 2 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 3, 2006

By: 

Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707